



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/560,819	12/15/2005	Gerard Laslaz	05165	6413
23338	7590	12/06/2007	EXAMINER	
DENNISON, SCHULTZ & MACDONALD			MORILLO, JANELL COMBS	
1727 KING STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 105			1793	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/06/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/560,819	LASLAZ ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Janelle Combs-Morillo	1793

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 December 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 121505.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-8, 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tamamura et al (US 4,163,266).

Tamamura teaches a cast Al-Si alloy comprising (in wt%):

8-15% Si
1-4% Cu
0.05-0.6% Mg
-0.15% Ni
-0.15% Mn
-0.15% Ti
-0.15% Zr
-0.7% Fe
-0.15% Cr
balance aluminum

(see Tamamura at abstract, column 6 lines 55-59), which overlaps the presently claimed ranges or maximum amounts of Si, Cu, Mg, Ni, Mn, Ti, Zr, Fe, Cr, Zn, and V (cl. 1-8), and touches the boundary of the presently claimed range of Mn (cl. 10). Because Tamamura teaches an overlapping alloy composition, then substantially the same 'high creep resistance' is expected, as for the claimed alloy. The examiner asserts that where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, a *prima facie* case of either anticipation or obviousness has

been established. *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 1255, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). "When the PTO shows a sound basis for believing that the products of the applicant and the prior art are the same, the applicant has the burden of showing that they are not." *In re Spada*, 911 F.2d 705, 709, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Therefore, if the prior art teaches the identical chemical structure, the properties applicant discloses and/or claims (such as creep resistance) are necessarily present.

Overlapping ranges have been held to be a prima facie case of obviousness, see MPEP § 2144.05. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select any portion of the range, including the claimed range, from the broader range disclosed in the prior art, because the prior art finds that said composition in the entire disclosed range has a suitable utility. Additionally, "The normal desire of scientists or artisans to improve upon what is already generally known provides the motivation to determine where in a disclosed set of percentage ranges is the optimum combination of percentages," *In re Peterson*, 65 USPQ2d at 1379 (CAFC 2003). Because Tamamura teaches an Al-Si alloy that overlaps or touches the boundary of the presently claimed alloying ranges, it is held that Tamamura has created a prima facie case of obviousness of the presently claimed invention.

Concerning claims 11 and 12, though Tamamura does not specify forming said alloy into an insert for a hot part (cl. 11) or a cylinder head (cl. 12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have formed the Al-Si alloy taught by Tamamura into an insert for a hot part (cl. 11) or a cylinder head (cl. 12), because Tamamura teaches said Al-Si alloy has excellent wear resistance (examples).

3. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tamamura et al (US 4,163,266) further in view of "Aluminum and Aluminum Alloys" p 45 or GB 605,282.

Tamamura is discussed in paragraphs above. Tamamura does not teach the addition of 0.04-0.20% V. However, "Aluminum and Aluminum Alloys" teaches that V is added to aluminum in order to raise the recrystallization temperature and for grain refinement. GB'282 teaches that 0.05-0.3% V is added as a grain refiner to Al-Si alloys (page 1 line 47-54). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add V as a grain refiner/ in order to raise the recrystallization temperature, of the Al-Si alloy taught by Tamamura, because the prior art teaches V is added for the predictable purpose of grain refinement.

Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Janelle Combs-Morillo whose telephone number is (571) 272-1240. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am- 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on (571) 272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:
10/560,819
Art Unit: 1793

Page 5

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JCM
December 3, 2007

R
ROY KING
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700